

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2792/306045.01
Application No.: 10/720,506
Office Action Dated: December 29, 2006

PATENT

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Fig(s) 1, 2, 3 and 4. The sheet(s), which includes Fig(s) 1, 2, 3, and 4, replaces the original sheet(s) including Fig(s) 1, 2, 3, 4.

Attachment: 4 Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 29, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-22 have been rejected. Claims 1, 8 and 22 are independent claims from which claims 2-7, and 9-21 respectively depend.

While Applicants do not agree with the grounds for rejection in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended the independent claims to more particularly point out the invention, which renders the stated grounds for rejection moot. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, define over the prior art. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the application as originally filed in paragraph [0026], [0036], [0039] and elsewhere.

The Declaration has been objected to as defective for only including the city, state and zip code however, upon viewing in PAIR, Applicant respectfully submits that a street address is clearly and legibly present on the Declaration as filed and requests the withdrawal of this objection.

Applicant respectfully requests confirmation that formal drawings filed by Applicant on November 24, 2003 as amended herewith have been accepted. The specification has been objected to for informalities. The specification has been amended. Withdrawal of the objections is requested. Claims 6-8, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20 and 22 have been objected to for informalities. The claims have been amended. Withdrawal of the objections is requested.

§112 Rejections

Claims 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for use of a trade name or trademark. The claims have been amended. Withdrawal of the 112 rejections of these claims is requested.

§101 Rejections

Claims 1-7 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to overcome these rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims are proper and request the withdrawal of the 101 rejections of these claims.

§102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-5, 8-13 and 15-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Goodwin, (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable because Goodwin does not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicant's amended independent claims.

Goodwin is directed to generating source code objects. Modeling tools provide input to a model adaptor that generates a unified model. The unified model and system definition are input to a code generator that generates the source code. Goodwin does not disclose or suggest at least a modeler that receives a block of source code and processes the code from an innermost element to an outermost element to generate a graphical representation of the structure and flow of the code as recited by Applicant's amended independent claims. Hence, Applicant submits that these claims and the claim that depend therefrom are allowable and request the withdrawal of the 102 rejections of these claims.

§103(a) Rejections

Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin in view of the Official Notice. Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for the reasons described above and request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims. Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin in view of Bailey (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,385). Bailey is directed to a program development environment in which developers can switch between a visual programming paradigm and a textual programming paradigm. Bailey does not disclose or suggest at least a modeler that receives a block of source code and processes the code from an innermost element to an outermost element to generate a graphical representation of the structure and flow of the code as recited by Applicant's amended independent claim 8 from which claim 14 depends. As neither Goodwin nor Bailey disclose or suggest all the features of Applicant's claim, Applicant submits that this claim is allowable and requests the withdrawal of the 103 rejection of this claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and an early allowance is earnestly solicited.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2792/306045.01
Application No.: 10/720,506
Office Action Dated: December 29, 2006

PATENT

Should the Examiner feel it would be helpful, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (215) 564-8270.

Date: March 29, 2007

/Susan C. Murphy/
Susan C. Murphy
Registration No. 46,221

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439